



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

HAN

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,464	12/08/2003	Lars Christian Herzbach	600.1294	2929
23280	7590	03/10/2005	EXAMINER	
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC 485 SEVENTH AVENUE, 14TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10018			WILLIAMS, KEVIN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2854	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/730,464	HERZBACH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kevin D. Williams	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2004.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                          |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)      |
|   | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <i>Dictionary.com, "coating"</i> . |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 8-10, 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wright (US 3,810,055).

Wright teaches a device for processing a printing substrate comprising a rotatable carrier body 10, at least one processing tool (plate; col. 2, line 37) accommodated on the rotatable carrier body, the carrier body having, at least partially, a magnetizable coating 12,14 , the magnetizable coating when magnetized holding the processing tool on the carrier body by magnetic force, the carrier body being magnetizable, the carrier body 10 being a rotating body or cylinder, the processing tool being accommodated on a lateral surface of the rotating body or cylinder, and a step of coating the rotatable carrier body with the magnetizable coating (Fig. 2).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2854

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 6, 7, 13-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Koga (US 5,424,815).

Wright teaches the claimed invention except for the magnetizable coating being an electroplating, the carrier body containing cast steel or a fiber composite, the thickness of the coating being between .001 and 10 mm, the thickness of the coating being between .01 mm to 1 mm, and the magnetizable coating being distributed in a uniform manner over the outer surface of the carrier body.

Koga teaches a carrier body 25 having a magnetizable coating 63 being an electroplating (col. 8, lines 11-17), the carrier body containing cast steel or a fiber composite (10; col. 5, line 21), the thickness of the coating being between .001 and 10 mm (col. 8, line 23), the thickness of the coating being between .01 mm to 1 mm (col. 8, line 23), and the magnetizable coating being distributed in a uniform manner over the outer surface of the carrier body.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wright to have the electroplated coating as taught by Koga, in order to conserve space by utilizing a coating method that deposits a thin layer of magnetizable material.

5. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Bain (US 5,038,680).

Wright teaches the claimed invention except for the coating being corrosion resistant stainless steel with a nickel content of 80 to 95 percent, and the nickel content being 91 to 93 percent and the rest iron.

Bain teaches a magnetic corrosion resistant stainless steel (col. 6, lines 64-66 for holding printing plates.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wright to have the stainless steel as taught by Bain, in order to utilize a durable yet inexpensive material.

It would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to additionally modify Wright through routine experimentation to have a nickel content of 80 to 95 percent and to have a nickel content of 91 to 93 percent and the rest iron.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Friedrichs (DE 10147486 A1).

Wright teaches the claimed invention except for the processing tool being a die plate or a perforating plate.

Friedrichs teaches a processing tool being a die plate 27 or a perforating plate.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wright to have the die plate as taught by Friedrichs, in order to allow the carrier body to function as a die cylinder, thus providing more versatility to the carrier body.

Art Unit: 2854

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Albus (US 2001/0045166).

Wright teaches the claimed invention except for at least one printing unit and a device for processing a printing substrate being arranged downstream of the printing unit.

Albus teaches at least one printing unit 13 and a device (plate cylinder 1 of downstream printing unit 14,15,16) for processing a printing substrate being arranged downstream of the printing unit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wright to have a plurality of printing units as taught by Albus, in order to print multicolor images.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments, with respect to claims 1, 2, 6-10, and 12 rejected as being anticipated by Koga have been fully considered and are persuasive. This rejection has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed 12/9/2004 with respect to claims 1, 3-5, and 8-12 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Wright does not disclose a coating. The term "coating" has been defined as "a layer of a substance spread over a surface for protection or decoration." *Dictionary.com*. Wright teaches a magnetizable layer 12,14 spread over the surface of the carrier body 10.

Art Unit: 2854

Applicant also argues that the printing plate in Wright is not a processing tool. Wright teaches a printing plate for processing print media being held on the carrier body by magnetic force.

***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin D. Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-2172. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew H. Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KDW  
March 7, 2005



REN YAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER